



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,019	07/21/2003	Shinobu Kuriya	09812.0358-00000	5079
22852	7590	07/03/2007	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2136			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/03/2007	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/624,019	KURIYA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks/Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 01/11/2007, applicant amends claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25 and 27. The following claims, claims 1-27, are presented for examination.

1.1 Applicant's arguments, pages 15-17, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-27 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1.2 In response to Applicant argument that the Ginter et al. reference does not teach or suggest transmitting a restoring request to a license server, or a restoring request that includes client identifying information, the Examiner respectfully disagrees citing paragraph 2038 which recites, "In order to make use of the VDE repository ... a VDE end user transmits a message from her VDE installation to the repository across the network indicating that she wishes to make use of the services provided by the repository (e.g. access content stored at and/or referenced by the repository, use credit provided by the repository, etc.). In response to this message, the user/author registration systems of the content system 3302A and the clearinghouse system 3302B of the repository transmit requests for information from the end user (e.g. in an on-line and/or batch interaction). The information requested by the user/author registration system of the content system 3302A may include type(s) of content that the user wishes to access, the characteristics of the user's electronic appliance 600, etc. The information

requested by the user/author registration system of the clearinghouse system 3302B may include whether the user wishes to establish a credit account with the clearinghouse system 3302B, what other forms of credit the user may wish to use for billing purposes, what other clearinghouses may be used by the end user in the course of interacting with content obtained from the repository, any general rules that the user has established regarding their preferences for release and handling of usage analysis information, etc. Once the end user has completed the registration information and transmitted it to the repository, the repository may construct an account profile for the user." The above recitation clearly reads upon the claimed limitations, thus the Applicant has not overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being disclosed by Ginter et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20060224903 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Ginter et al., discloses a information processing apparatus for controlling, based on a usage right issued from a license server, the decryption and use of encrypted content for the usage right, said information processing apparatus comprising: means for transmitting, to said license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof, and verification data for the client identifying information; means for receiving a response to the restoring request from said license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to at least one usage right already issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof; means for transmitting, to said license server, a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and means for receiving, from said license server, in response to the usage-right request, the usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (2006-2038).

Regarding claim 2, Ginter et al., discloses a information processing apparatus for controlling, based on a usage right issued from a license server, the decryption and use of encrypted content for the usage right, said information processing apparatus comprising: means for transmitting, to said license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof, and verification data for the client identifying information; means for receiving a response to the restoring

request from said license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to at least one usage right already issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof; means for transmitting, to said license server, a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and means for receiving, from said license server, in response to the usage-right request, the usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (2006-2038).

Regarding claim 3, Ginter et al., discloses a information processing apparatus for controlling, based on a usage right issued from a license server, the decryption and use of encrypted content for the usage right, said information processing apparatus comprising: means for transmitting, to said license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof, and verification data for the client identifying information; means for receiving a response to the restoring request from said license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to at least one usage right already issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof; means for transmitting, to said license server, a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and means for receiving, from said license server, in response to the usage-right request, the usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (2006-2038).

Regarding claim 4, Ginter et al., discloses a information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the verification data is obtained by performing hash processing on information including the client identifying information (2006-2038).

Regarding claim 5, Ginter et al., discloses a information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein: the response to the restoring request includes a transaction ID for identifying a restoring transaction; said information processing apparatus further comprises: means for transmitting, to said license server, a registering request including the transaction ID; and means for receiving registering information including the encryption key required for decrypting the content, the registering information being transmitted from said license server in response to the registering request; and the usage-right request includes the transaction ID (2006-2038).

Regarding claim 6, Ginter et al., discloses a license server for issuing, to clients, usage rights to permit the use of content, said license server comprising: means for storing usage-right identifying information on the issued usage rights in units of the clients; means for receiving a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying each of the clients and verification data for the client identifying information; means for, when verification of the verification data confirms that the restoring request is valid, performing acquisition based on the

client identifying information of usage-right identifying information on usage rights already issued to the clients, and transmitting the acquired usage-right identifying information as a response to the restoring request; means for receiving a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and means for transmitting, in response to the usage-right request, a usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 1).

Regarding claim 7, Ginter et al., discloses a license server according to claim 6, wherein each of the usage rights includes the client identifying information and a signature, and the client identifying information identifies an information processing apparatus or the user thereof capable of using content for the usage right (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 and 3).

Regarding claim 8, Ginter et al., discloses a license server according to claim 6, wherein the verification data is obtained by performing hash processing on information including the client identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 4).

Regarding claim 9, Ginter et al., discloses a license server according to claim 6, wherein: a response to the restoring request includes a transaction ID for identifying a restoring transaction; said license server further comprises: means

for receiving a registering request including the transaction ID; and means for transmitting, in response to the registering request, registering information including the encryption key required for decrypting the content; and the usage-right request includes the transaction ID (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 5).

Regarding claim 10, Ginter et al., discloses an information processing method for controlling, based on a usage right issued from a license server, the decryption and use of encrypted content for the usage right, said information processing method comprising the steps of: transmitting, to said license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of an information processing apparatus and the user thereof, and verification data for the client identifying information; receiving a response to the restoring request from said license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to at least one usage right already issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof; transmitting, to said license server, a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and receiving, from said license server, in response to the usage-right request, the usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 1).

Regarding claim 11, Ginter et al., discloses an information processing method according to claim 10, wherein: the response to the restoring request includes content identifying information for identifying the content for the usage right; and said information processing method further comprises the steps of: transmitting, to a content server, a content request based on the content identifying information; and receiving content transmitted from the content server in response to the content request (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 2).

Regarding claim 12, Ginter et al., discloses an information processing method according to claim 10, wherein the usage right includes the client identifying information and a signature, and the client identifying information identifies said information processing apparatus or the user thereof, in which the identified apparatus or user can use content for the usage right (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 and 3).

Regarding claim 13, Ginter et al., discloses an information processing method according to claim 10, wherein the verification data is obtained by performing hash processing on information including the client identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 4).

Regarding claim 14, Ginter et al., discloses an information processing method according to claim 10, wherein: the response to the restoring request includes a

transaction ID for identifying a restoring transaction; said information processing method further comprises the steps of: transmitting, to said license server, a registering request including the transaction ID; and receiving registering information including the encryption key required for decrypting the content, the registering information being transmitted from said license server in response to the registering request; and the usage-right request includes the transaction ID (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 5).

Regarding claim 15, Ginter et al., discloses a method for controlling a license server for issuing, to clients, usage rights to permit the use of content, said method comprising the steps of: storing usage-right identifying information on the issued usage rights in units of the clients; receiving a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying each of the clients and verification data for the client identifying information; performing, when verification of the verification data confirms that the restoring request is valid, acquisition based on the client identifying information of usage-right identifying information on usage rights already issued to the clients, and transmission of the acquired usage-right identifying information as a response to the restoring request; receiving a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and transmitting, in response to the usage-right request, a usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 1).

Regarding claim 16, Ginter et al., discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein each of the usage rights includes the client identifying information and a signature, and the client identifying information identifies an information processing apparatus or the user thereof capable of using content for the usage right (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 and 3).

Regarding claim 17, Ginter et al., discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein the verification data is obtained by performing hash processing on information including the client identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 4).

Regarding claim 18, Ginter et al., discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein: a response to the restoring request includes a transaction ID for identifying a restoring transaction; said method further comprises the steps of: receiving a registering request including the transaction ID; and transmitting, in response to the registering request, registering information including the encryption key required for decrypting the content; and the usage-right request includes the transaction ID (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 5).

Regarding claim 19, Ginter et al., discloses a program for causing a computer to control, based on a usage right issued from a license server, the decryption and use of encrypted content for the usage right, said program comprising the steps

of: transmitting, to said license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of an information processing apparatus and the user thereof, and verification data for the client identifying information; receiving a response to the restoring request from said license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to at least one usage right already issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user thereof; transmitting, to said license server, a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and receiving, from said license server, in response to the usage-right request, the usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 1).

Regarding claim 20, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 19, wherein: the response to the restoring request includes content identifying information for identifying the content for the usage right; and said program further comprises the steps of: transmitting, to a content server, a content request based on the content identifying information; and receiving content transmitted from the content server in response to the content request (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 2).

Regarding claim 21, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 19, wherein the usage right includes the client identifying information and a

signature, and the client identifying information identifies said information processing apparatus or the user thereof, in which the identified apparatus or user can use content for the usage right (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 3).

Regarding claim 22, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 19, wherein the verification data is obtained by performing hash processing on information including the client identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 4).

Regarding claim 23, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 19, wherein: the response to the restoring request includes a transaction ID for identifying a restoring transaction; said program further comprises the steps of: transmitting, to said license server, a registering request including the transaction ID; and receiving registering information including the encryption key required for decrypting the content, the registering information being transmitted from said license server in response to the registering request; and the usage-right request includes the transaction ID (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 5).

Regarding claim 24, Ginter et al., discloses a program for controlling a license server for issuing, to clients, usage rights to permit the use of content, said program comprising the steps of: storing usage-right identifying information on

the issued usage rights in units of the clients; receiving a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying each of the clients and verification data for the client identifying information; performing, when verification of the verification data confirms that the restoring request is valid, acquisition based on the client identifying information of usage-right identifying information on usage rights already issued to the clients, and transmission of the acquired usage-right identifying information as a response to the restoring request; receiving a usage-right request including the usage-right identifying information; and transmitting, in response to the usage-right request, a usage right corresponding to the usage-right identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 1).

Regarding claim 25, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 24, wherein each of the usage rights includes the client identifying information and a signature, and the client identifying information identifies an information processing apparatus or the user thereof capable of using content for the usage right (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 and 3).

Regarding claim 26, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 24, wherein the verification data is obtained by performing hash processing on information including the client identifying information (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 4).

Regarding claim 27, Ginter et al., discloses a program according to claim 24, wherein: a response to the restoring request includes a transaction ID for identifying a restoring transaction; said program further comprises the steps of: receiving a registering request including the transaction ID; and transmitting, in response to the registering request, registering information including the encryption key required for decrypting the content; and the usage-right request includes the transaction ID (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 4).

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo whose telephone number is (571) 272 2662. The examiner can normally be reached on MWF 9:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



CCO

June 24, 2007

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


6/25/07